Dear Howard, 11/8/77

In the event you do not see it I'm enclosing a copy of today's Anderson/Whitten column. They "uncovered" this secret memo by Les opening his mail-from me.

I have also sent him the one-page Johnson memo on Ford's corruption of the 1/27 transcript and referred him to the treatment and comparison and direct quotes from his ~~extraordinary~~ confirmation hearing. That one will be harder.

The brief story on Bud's CIA suit reflects his finally listening to Jim and me. He has spent so much time on FOIA cases of his own that he is quitting them.

I spoke to Jim about this a long time ago and offered help. Jim spoke to Bud and repeated this offer and some of his own, plus specific suggestions about what bud should use of what we had done.

Bud didn't do it. But he called to see if I was free for Sunday afternoon and then despite bad weather did come. I repeated advice I know Jim gave him earlier, use the 1/27 transcript which the CIA got the Archives to withhold from me for years claiming the identical exemptions and needs they now seek to use against him.

This time Bud agreed. I gave him another copy of it and pointed passages out. I suppose he used it.

It is the kind of thing that could turn a man like Sirica on. He gets mad. He'll find reason to believe he has been imposed upon and lied to and that can make him mad. We'll see.

I've not used any of the FBI's King records for a number of reasons and on no occasion have I used any in public until they claimed full compliance. The first time they did this I held a well-covered press conference and gave it all away. This coincides with the most recent time and immediately preceeds our conference on compliance/non-compliance the end of this week.

Maybe they'll get the idea that I don't have to keep quiet forever and that while very few people will take the time to go through close to 50,000 pages I have already done it. One of their games is to keep me from writing. We'll, they can ponder the alternatives now. I've given them a new one.

The Lardner story on the House assassins also was from me, virtually all that was uncredited, too, especially the Beckham stuff, all of which and more I read to him word for word over the phone. I had no reaction to it all day yesterday but then he disguised me as his source except where he quoted me, which did not disclose me as the source. Ditto for Les, which you can just about always expect. The format.

As you go through the records you've received I hope you will try to keep in mind the uses Jim and I can make. One is obvious, the unmet Privacy Act requests. Another is official withholdings relevant to our litigation. I've sent Jim a bunch of stuff I've gotten in the King case and from my PA request of the FBI that he can use if he can find the means in the spectro and transcript cases. There is that potential in this new stuff, which he had not yet received from Bud when we spoke yesterday. Jim is thinking about moving the appeals court to accept what was withheld on discovery, for example, now that we have some.

The sheer enormity of what we have done and obtained overwhelms the mind, Jim's now as well as mine, alas. So suggestions are really a need if you can find time.

In the still-unred long draft of my PA letter to Rhoads based on what I recalled after one skimming of the 10/28 records I have in mind a number of objectives and possible uses. All require a detailed record, one of the reasons for the length. They all require a direct challenge of their strongest asset, their own records and their own representations of their records. These objectives range from seeking redrees for violations of my rights and wasting me to stregthening both Acts. If you do not know it, there has been an effort from the first to vitiate them again. I have been aware of this for a long time, was able to forecast the line they'd take and found them doing as predicted as long ago as year this past July. With the existing prejudices it may well be that Jim and I may not figure directly in this but he has given the Nader people something they have already used in FOIA subcommittee testimony in the Senate. I may make a more direct effrt. I've not made my mind up...Hope New Orleans was-will be-memorable. Best,